THE DOGMAS

OF THE

Intercession

AND

INVOCATION OF SAINTS

INTEGRAL PARTS OF A SYSTEM,

Derogatory to the Word of God, and Dishonourable to the one Mediator,

PROVED FROM HISTORY AND SCRIPTURE;

AND

Mr. Provost Whitaker's Statements,

CONTAINED IN HIS TWO LETTERS RELATING THERETO,

CONSIDERED AND ANSWERED.

BY

REV. G. EVANS, M.A.

COLOSSIANS II. 8, 18.

TORONTO:
GLOBE STEAM PRESS, 25 KING STREET WEST.
1861.

L 55577
Nov. 3/58

INTERCESSION AND INVOCATION OF SAINTS,

DEROGATORY TO THE WORD OF GOD.

A MEMORABLE instance is related in Holy Writ of a warm friend and zealous advocate of the Christian cause presuming to introduce spurious principles into the doctrines of the incipient church, and thereby drawing upon himself the stern rebuke and indignant remonstrance of another zealous friend and advocate of the same cause. Need I say that the defaulter on this occasion was the Apostle St. Peter; and the circumstance is recorded with some degree of pertinency, as if intended to point out the folly of supposing that the Christian church could be founded upon the fallible Peter, and not upon Peter's anterior confession, "Thou art the Christ"—the rock of ages, the tried corner stone, the sure foundation.

But there may be other occasions wherein a servant of the Most High may feel it his privilege, as well as his duty, to defend the simplicity of the Christian system against the assaults of its friends as well as its enemies; that in the case now referred to, the defaulter should be a friend of the cause of religion is in no wise remarkable, and only demonstrates that the most eminent Christian and scholar may, like St. Peter, judge erroneous judgment, and also, like that Apostle, subject himself "to be blamed." (Gal. ii.)

Having somewhat recently taken up a pamphlet, containing two letters, which give the substance of the College controversy, and my eye resting upon intercession of saints, I have been led to follow the Provost through his arguments on that

question, and in doing so have been much surprised to learn that the rev. gentleman, in a very peremptory manner, asserts his determination to teach and defend the dogma of the intercession of saints; and I have been no less surprised when learning the *modus operandi* by which he seeks to give any shade of importance to such a principle of faith; and to this point I would now direct particular attention.

Whatever benefit may accrue to the church and schools from the use of the writings of eminent divines, as helps to understand the scriptures, certainly nothing can result from the abuse—that is, when those eminent divines are set up as infallible textuarians, or as it were Rabbies of the church, whose dicta we must implicitly follow under fear and trembling of "setting at nought the great authorities of the Church." —(Letter 2, page 92.) Such a system of teaching in early youth will soon lead to a regarding the scriptures as subordinate to the text books. It was by a somewhat similar process the Jews, adopting their Targums, had, in our Lord's time, nearly extinguished the light of the Old Testament writings. Such a process, as I gather from the Bishop of Huron's letter, prefixed to the pamphlet, is exemplified in the College teaching; first, we have a manuscript text book, or Targum—secondly, a number of authorities, Rabbies (the Rabbies of the Jewish church were those that added to the written law the traditions of the Targum or Talmud.) These similar authorities are introduced in the pamphlet under the head of intercession of saints—all advocates of the dogma—all affirming that the doctrine is not contrary to Scripture. The Provost coincides with these authorities, and affirms the same things; but neither he nor they venture to demonstrate that the doctrine is in agreement, or coincidence, or *with* Scripture; therefore, if received in the church, it must necessarily be a tradition, which completes the above analogical summary. Here the Provost sets at nought the scriptures; but how as to his text book? He asserts his deter-

mination to teach and defend the intercession of saints; and why? His reason is stated in the following extract, (page 92):—

"Respecting the intercesssion of saints, in addition to the plea that *Pearson, our text book*, is followed, I may add, that so long as I lecture on the Articles, and so doing necessarily treat of the Romish error of invocation of saints, so long must I necessarily refer to the intercession of saints departed, in our behalf; it *cannot be escaped;* I must speak of it either as a probable belief, not contrary to Scripture, or as a presumptuous and unwarrantable conceit, dishonourable to the one Mediator between God and man. The latter I will never do, because it is contradictory to my reason, and against my conscience; and my position as a teacher in the Church of England does but add to the impropriety of my doing so, as in so doing I should be setting at nought the authorities of her great divines."

It will easily be imagined that in introducing such a doctrine as that of intercession of saints into his teaching in a public Protestant institution, and into discussion in a Protestant community,[a] the learned gentleman would have many opponents whose opinions might have deserved more respect than he seems to have given them.

The followers of John Knox, of Martin Luther, and they of the Anglican Church, have again and again protested against the dogma of intercession of saints, yet this gentleman treats the opinions of such men as nothing more than "miserable cant," and through the whole of his pamphlet he deals with those who differ with him in opinion, with a degree of intolerance more becoming a creed which may possibly agree with him in his doctrinal views, and commend his zeal in the defence of the doctrine of intercession of saints.

Before entering into a general view of the subject, I would call attention to the system of reasoning adopted by the advocates of this dogma, whereby they seek to gain our acceptance of the tenet. In the passage above referred to, the Provost

here the Provost assumes that Pearson is on his side

uses the following language:—"I may add, that so long as I lecture on the Articles, and in so doing, necessarily treat of the Romish error of invocation of saints, so long must I refer to the intercession of saints in our behalf." Here it is very remarkable he acknowledges that the invocation of saints is a Romish error, but the intercession of saints an orthodox truth. In this enunciation he reasons from the effect to the cause, which is called an *a posteriori* argument. In medical jurisprudence the skillful physician usually assumes an *a priori* argument—that is, from cause to effect. No doubt he also takes an *a posteriori* view when he investigates the effects in order to ascertain the cause and remove the seat of the disease, knowing well that certain causes will produce certain effects; but he does not usually palliate or strengthen the cause, that the effects may become more virulent and incurable. Now, this is precisely what the learned Provost *does do;* he strengthens the cause in order to invigorate the effect. Would any one of common sense say that the Romanist would stultify himself by invocating St. Mary or St. Dominick if he were not *taught to believe* that both St. Mary and St. Dominick have power in heaven to make favourable intercession in his behalf? Would any one, even in earthly things, supplicate a favour from a patron who had either no favour to bestow or was powerless to bestow it?

This *a posteriori* view is taken by all the co-advocates of the dogma, (page 47,) some of whom enter into a spurious philosophical disquisition respecting the difference between meritorious and deprecatory intercession, to which the Provost invites particular attention; but although these authors point out the abuse of the doctrine of intercession of saints, not one of them has taken upon himself the necessary task of pointing out the order for its use. They proclaim anathemas against the use of invocation—the effect—but not one of them holds out a nostrum to eradicate and remove the cause; thus, while these

see page 23

authors seem to teach the reader the avoidance of one error; they lead him imperceptibly into the other.

"*Incidit in Scyllam, cupiens vitare Charybdim.*"

An *a posteriori* view, when rightly used, is good in argument; thus, *a priori*, we assume that God necessarily exists as a first cause, and author of everything, but, *a posteriori*, we prove His existence by His works—

"*Agnoscimus Deum ex operibus ejus.*"

The Provost very properly combines cause and effect in the same category, but he does not begin *a priori* with the first principle, and say, when I necessarily treat of the intercession of saints in our behalf, so long must I refer to our invocating the prayers of the saints on our behalf; that would be bringing cause and effect into too consecutive a proximity to suit his doctrine, and therefore he removes the cause to the background in his sentence and brings the effect to the front, and by giving to the one the character of error, and the other the character of truth—(there being no necessary connection between error and truth)—we do not at first sight perceive the fallacy; but when he reasons *a posteriori* he repudiates the effect, and therefore his proposition is a nullity, the only conclusion which it produces being, that, to think differently would be "against his conscience, and setting at nought the authorities of his great divines."

In the following pages I have endeavoured to give the reader a brief sketch of the origin of the dogmas of intercession and invocation of saints, and in so doing to demonstrate that these doctrines, as now entertained in the Romish church, still retain their former pagan characteristics; and also to demonstrate that the doctrine of intercession of saints, as taught by Provost Whitaker, and affirmed in the pamphlet, is in principle repugnant to the Word of God.

There are three points of doctrine in the seventh article of the creed of Pope Pius IV., only two of which I shall make the subject of argument.

1. The saints reigning together with Christ are to be honoured and invocated.

2. The saints offer up prayer to God for us.

To which I will add the Trinity College proposition, as enunciated in the manuscript catechism.

3. On our part reverential commemoration and imitation, and on their part (part of the saints,) interest in our behalf, and probable intercession with God for us.

These three propositions are so nearly allied, they may be considered separately or conjunctively—*tria juncta in uno.*

The doctrines contained in the second and third heads are taught and advocated in Trinity College.

On these points of doctrinal teaching the Bishop of Huron objects, conceiving that to young men so instructed a transition to the use of invocation of saints, as affirmed in the first head of the Pius IV. creed, will be an easy and natural consequence.

In page 48 of his second letter, the Provost very feelingly expresses his respect for the scruples of honest-minded persons, who, he says, "dread the suggestion that departed saints pray for us, only because this hypothesis would imply an invasion of the prerogative of the one Mediator." Such, in the absence of any scriptural proof that departed saints do pray for us, or that their prayers can add anything to the perfect advocacy of the glorified Redeemer, would seem a very honest and just scruple, if not by divine grace a very probable safeguard against the transition the Bishop apprehends; and the Provost asks, somewhat triumphantly, would such a transition have been easy to the martyr Ridley? and he throws out an implied disparagement upon the *individual* who could even suppose such a declension. But he forgets that this is not the age of martyrdom, and that all men are not endued with the firmness and faith of a martyr, to resist, like Ridley, a transition from one innovation to another. It has also escaped his memory, that the Bishop's apprehensions have no application to martyrs, but to the youth of the College, whose tender minds may, as phil-

osopher Locke says, be compared to a tabula rasa, or sheet of white paper, upon which impressions may be easily photographed.

The Provost, while he asserts his determination to teach the doctrine of intercession of saints, tells us with great candour, that he only regards that tenet as a probable belief or *pious* opinion; but in order to impart to it even this phase of authority he adduces the following argument or analogy:

"If a good man, departed out of this life, continues to offer for his friends and for the church at large the *same* supplications he was wont to offer upon earth, in the name and for the sake of Christ, can it, with any shadow of reason, be maintained that the one intercession more than the other trenches on the inviolable prerogative of Him by whom alone we come unto the Father?" (Page 48.)

To this very speculative question I would reply by asking another, equally speculative:—Does the learned querist here suppose that, except as to the repose of the soul in Paradise we have any adequate scriptural information regarding its state and intercourse with God, either in prayer or praise, anterior to the assumption of its glorified resurrection body? If he can give no satisfactory answer to this inquiry, then, as regards his question, I will say he assumes premises from whence there can be no conclusion.

When good men make prayers and supplications and give thanks for all men, uniting with their fellow worshippers in the visible tabernacle of the church here on earth, they then perform a commanded duty, and an enjoined act of union and communion with Christ and His church—but on this question we cannot reason from what is commanded to that which is not commanded.

When the souls of good men pass the dark valley of the shadow of death, and enter into the unknown and invisible world, we know not what privileges they enjoy, or how qualified they may be in any kind or degree to make acceptable inter-

cession in our behalf before the throne of the one God and one Mediator.

We know not, also, how far the *locale* of blessedness they have attained can give them the place in heaven here assigned to them—viz., a reigning together with Christ, or as it is expressed in some of the references given in the pamphlet, "the very glorified saints in heaven"—"the saints in heaven."

Although much is said in Scripture by way of antipast, as giving the believer a foretaste of the fruition of the kingdom of heaven, and the blessedness of a future life, yet here there seems to be a vacuum in Scripture information—the hopes of the dying penitent being directed to the second advent of the glorified Redeemer, when He shall come again in like manner, or with the same body, which the Apostles beheld on the day of the ascension, *when* our resuscitated bodies, which slept in the dust of the earth, shall be reunited to our souls, and *made perfect* by the *assumption of bodies like that of the glorified Redeemer*. This is the scriptural view, and is confirmed by the following very practical reasons.

Christ, who was perfect God and perfect man, was in His human soul the exemplar and pattern of the transitions of our human souls; we know that He spake to the penitent thief of a place to which his own human soul was departing, a place of paradise, where His soul would not be until after the death of His body. It was not heaven, for Christ was not translated to heaven until the subsequent day of His ascension, when, still as our exemplar, His human body had been raised from the dead, and had been reunited to His human soul, which then quitted Paradise. To suppose, therefore, the doctrine contained in our general proposition—the saints reigning together with Christ—would be stretching the antipast too far. But in reference to the first and second sections of the Pope Pius IV. creed, it is an old Pagan notion modernized, a revival of the Platonic philosophy by the Christians of the "*latter times*," the doctrine mentioned by

St. Paul in his Epistle to Timothy; and now exemplified in the Romish ritual of deified saints, St. Mary, St. Dominick, St. Benedict—saints reigning together with Christ—who are "honoured and invocated, and make intercession for their brethren here on earth, and for the church at large."

In order to prove this view of the subject, and also to demonstrate that the doctrine of intercession of saints, as affirmed in the Trinity College proposition, is contrary to the Word of God, it will be necessary to take a short review of the origin of the doctrines under contemplation. In doing so, I shall follow the Provost through his two letters.

It must be inferred from the statement, page 92, second letter, that the doctrines of the intercession of saints and the invocation of saints, are so interwoven together that the one cannot be discussed without the other; this, the statement tells us, "cannot be escaped;" therefore they are allied principles, adjuncts the one of the other, phases of the same doctrine; wherefore, also, if the one be contrary to Scripture so must the other, and, therefore, must both proceed *pari passu* without warrant of Scripture. It is taught in the College manuscripts that communion of saints consists in, "on our part reverential commemoration and imitation, and on their part (the part of the saints) interest in our behalf and probable intercession with God for us." There being no scriptural proof of this theory, we must look outside Scripture for its origin and connexion with its kindred dogma, the invocation of saints.

Long anterior to the Christian era, an opinion prevailed that the souls of illustrious men and great heroes, after their decease, were elevated to the heavens, where they might mediate for the human race, take an interest in their affairs, and intercede with Deity in their behalf. This system of theology is affirmed by Plato in the eleventh book of his laws, hence it spread very generally among the Greeks and Romans, and other Gentile nations, who, being ignorant of the true God, superstitiously venerated their departed heroes, whom they deified, and whose favour they supplicated, under the

seemingly *pious opinion* that the celestial gods were too sublime and pure to be profaned with the approach of earthly beings.

Error being traditionary as well as infectious, some foolish Christians and even Jews in St. Paul's time, under similar pretences of pious humility, or fear of approaching too boldly to God, addressed their prayers *to angels* instead of the deified saints of the Greeks and Romans. (Col. ii. 18.) This brought forth a strong remonstrance on the part of the Apostle, wherein he adopts a species of argumentation very frequently used by him throughout his epistles—I mean the system of counter elements. Thus, in reference to the subject before us, he uses the remarkable form of words "the fulness of the Godhead bodily," implying that mysterious union in our Lord's person of all the qualities and attributes, human and divine, (requirements which neither angel nor man could accomplish,) which were essential to constitute Him the perfect Mediator between God and man; and upon this principle, the perfection of our Lord's offering of those embodied qualities—mediatorial, propitiatory, and *intercessory*—he draws the following necessary conclusion, "and ye are complete in Him;" and then, by a transition to the counter elements of the case, he tells the Colossians to beware—"Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ."* (Col. ii. viii. see verse 18.) Pursuing this enquiry we learn that the Apostles and their successors, through much trial and difficulty, succeeded in planting a church, which, renouncing the Pagan philosophy, continued in the simplicity of the gospel religion for at least the three first centuries of the Christian era.

But the Church was not destined to repose long in the true faith. St. Paul had already announced to Timothy the coming of a great apostasy, the peculiarities and nature of which should resemble those of the Pagan philosophers.

* Verses 8 and 18 considered categorically.

This apostasy progressed slowly and imperceptibly (as a disease which gradually works in the human frame, before it takes possession of the whole system.) A well informed writer upon these questions very correctly remarks "a distinction must be made between the apostasy in its individual and unauthorized state, and the apostasy in its corporate and dominant state." The latter form it did not acquire until the beginning of the seventh century, when it became firmly established under the rule and dominance of the Roman Pontiff.

The peculiarities and novelties of this *now* established apostasy, (seventh century,) the accomplished historian who collated the events of these times, very clearly exhibits in the following graphic sketch.

"The Christians of the seventh century had ostensibly relapsed into a semblance of Paganism. Their public and private vows were addressed to the relics and images that disgraced the temples of the East; the throne of the Almighty was darkened by a crowd of martyrs, and saints, and angels; the Virgin Mary was invested with the name and honours of a goddess; the saints and martyrs whose *intercession was implored* were seated on the right hand of God; the devout Christian prayed before the image of a saint, and the Pagan rites of genuflexion, luminaries, and incense, stole into the Catholic church; the scruples of reason and piety were silenced by the strong evidence of visions and miracles, and pictures which speak, and move, and bleed, must be endowed with divine energy as the proper objects of religious adoration."—Gibbon's History, vol. 9.

This extract points out the connexion between the Pagan and Papal systems of theology. Standford's Hand Book to the Romish controversy gives a tabular view of the dates and periods when certain other innovations crept into the Papal creed—through the medieval period to the sixteenth century.

With the exception of some later innovations regarding the "immaculate conception," and devotional exercises and cere-

monies in the worship of the Virgin Mary, (month of Mary,) as now used in the R. C. church of Canada, and certain other ceremonies in the worship of the canonized Saint Januarius in Naples, where the blood of that distinguished tutelary saint, preserved in a glass bottle, is said to liquify and become tepid, in token of the saint's acceptance of prayer, the Church of Rome, in the nineteenth century, preserves her boasted characteristics of being "unchangeable and unchanged."

I have now endeavoured, in so far as a desire to epitomise the subject would permit, to drag this monster heresy from its temples among the earlier Gentiles, and to exhibit it in the phase which it assumed in St. Paul's time, (Col. ii. 18,) and from thence to its predicted reappearance in nearly its original form, in the seventh century, in reference to which reappearance the Apostle prophetically uses the same word by which it was known to the Greek philosophers, (1 Tim. iv. 1,) the objects and principles being the same—viz., the departed deified saint, translated into the heavens, reigning together with Christ, invested with powers of making intercession in man's behalf.

We have now to follow the semi-chameleon monster in the hue of *piety* in which it is clothed in the pamphlet, and authoritatively taught in Trinity College. All men are fallible, and most men very tenacious of their own adopted theories, and even when reason makes against them, will endeavour to qualify or compromise them, possibly by telling us that their theories are pious, and not contrary to Scripture; and this leads to the third proposition as it is recited in the pamphlet—"and on their part (part of the saints) probable intercession with God for us."

It would seem supererogatory to waste words in refuting a doctrine which claims no higher authority than that of its being a probable opinion, but we learn also that it gains some importance from its being a pious opinion. So thought the Pagan philosophers when they invocated their departed heroes,

and so thinks the humble suppliant when he bows before the bottle of St. Januarius, and waits with anxiety the liquifaction of the blood, which is, as it were, to telegraph to him that his sins have been remitted through the intercession of the great Saint Januarius.

Pious opinion! In the absence of any scriptural proof of this dogma, it is to be expected that the learned gentleman should be anxious to add a specialty to the importance of the *pious* opinion, by quoting a long string of extracts from writers favourable to his view. It is not necessary that we should question the eminence of those writers in their degree, but we must adjudge them oracular in their authority, when presented to us under the responsibility of inforcing upon the consciences of men, especially young men, who may be destined for the ministry in this province, doctrines so pernicious and counter elemental to the principles of our Protestant reformed faith.

The learned gentleman, if we are to judge by his expressions, considers it a sort of *sine qua non* that every Churchman should implicitly believe in the principles expounded in the extracts he has quoted; and the non-acceptance of the dicta of his Rabbi, he deems can only be "accounted for on the hypothesis of disgraceful ignorance, or still more disgraceful dishonesty;" and he goes on in this strain of confident assurance to impugn those who do not in all points swear by his text-book—"*in verba jurare magistri*,"—as aiding and abetting with Pope Pius in imposing an Index Expurgatorius, which is not only to exclude his favourite authors from being heard in whatsoever they may say in accordance with Scripture, but, using his own phraseology, "to erect ignorance as the palladium of our reformed communion;" and then, (on the point of ignorance,) in page 90 he reaches his climax—"A very little information, and a very little love of truth, would prevent the putting forth such statements; and if the former be the antidote required, I hope it may be found in these

pages." Truly, if in reference to the subject of discussion, paucity of information, or paucity of truth, is to be measured by plenitude of right knowledge and sound information, the Provost must shew by the exhibition of those qualities in the pages of his pamphlet, that *we* are labouring under the bane, before we shall require *the antidote*.

But, as he evidently rests the importance of his case on the opinions of the authors he has cited, it will be necessary to make a few observations respecting this point of enquiry. Yet, first, I would premise, that in this view of the question the enquiry is not one of comparing scripture with scripture, precept upon precept, line upon line, but it is an enquiry as to comparing opinion with opinion. It is not an enquiry of, let God's word be true, and man's opinion fallacious; it is not an enquiry as to what saith the scripture, but what saith a Pearson, a Bull, and a Beveridge! Surely, when the opinions of uninspired writers are so magnified, and put in competition with the infallible word of truth, we must be prepared to expect something of paramount importance—"*Parturiunt montes.*" What say the writers?

Now it is not a little remarkable that although more than twelve authors are cited, not *three* scripture references *bearing directly* on the point, are adduced; and what is not less remarkable, these authors, nearly one and all, as if aware of the sequence pointed out by the Bishop of Huron respecting the easy transition from one innovation to another, take some pains while *commending* the doctrine of intercession of saints, to interpose a caution against adopting the use of invocation. This indeed is commendable, since even in things rightly ordained, there is a natural proneness in man to abuse every ordinance and means of grace, making them substitutes for Christ, and *a fortiori*, the same proneness to abuse what is not rightly ordained—viz., an ordinance proposing to him the adventitious support and interest of departed saints!

In perusing the extracts selected from Pearson, Bull, and

other authors, upon whose authority, as regards the point at issue, the Provost so implicitly relies, I confess I am somewhat disappointed, in finding that the whole weight of the importance attached to the testimony of these writers resolves itself into what in common parlance is called matter of opinion.

But there is one point of opinion elicited in these extracts, which deserves special notice. It is the speculative enquiry, how far the saints who intercede for us, and take an interest in our concerns, are cognizant of our wants and necessities.

This seems to be a debatable question among the learned gentleman's great divines—since by consulting the quotations in pages 49, 50, 51, 52, we find one takes the affirmative, (Thorndike,) another (Bull,) the negative, a third (Ridley,) the hypothetical, and last not least, (Crakanthorp,) the conditional.

As to the case of Ridley, the Provost conceives he here adduces a perfectly conclusive argument. Affirming the truth of his doctrine, he says: "I close this long and weighty list of authorities with a testimony which presents to us no stern controversial argument—no dry enunciation of theoretical belief—but a most affecting practical adoption of the opinion condemned by the Bishop of Huron, on the part of one of our great reformers, in addressing another on his way to martyrdom." And then follow Ridley's words, the *ipsissima verba* (page 52): "And then thou, good brother, pray for the remnant which are to suffer for Christ's sake, *according* to that thou *then* shalt know *more clearly*."

I contend that these words imply an uncertain and unknown contingency, and are much too indefinite to warrant an absolute conclusion. And even if Ridley had held this heretical dogma, that would be nothing in its favour, since many of the early reformers, emerging out of Romanism, did not altogether and at once shake off the errors of the Papal creed. We who are encompassed with infirmities, would require

an intercessor respecting whose knowledge of our wants, and whose intuition into the recesses of our heart, there can be no such difference of opinion. And this speculative enquiry may be answered by reference to another text book, (Rom. viii. 29.) This speculative enquiry is suggestive of a very natural reflection—viz.: that if the departed saints, whether literally or spiritually, have (*now*) the privilege of reigning with Christ, and apprehending the perfection of His alone intercession, they will behold such an amplitude of infinite merit and infinite satisfaction in that alone intercession, they will the rather veil their faces, and imitate the office of the seraphims, than that of the intercessor.

"And each one had six wings, and with twain he covered his face, and with twain he covered his feet, and with twain he did fly; and one cried unto another and said: Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of Hosts, the whole earth is full of his glory." (Is. vi.)

Again, referring to the pamphlet (page 90,) some notice is given as to the dates of the authorities cited, and the circumstance of their belonging to the 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries, is stated as supplemental to the importance already allotted them, and also as the Provost informs us, for the special purpose of silencing the "*miserable cant*" of those who have taken exception to his doctrine. This additament to his case will give little advantage to him, while it affords to me the opportunity of bringing into the field a writer of no mean degree, the author of the celebrated work the "*Clavis Apocalyptica.*" Mr. Joseph Mede, Fellow of Cambridge University, died Oct. 1, 1638. Turning to the pages of this immortal work, I find "the profoundly learned and pious" author far antidates my sketch of the origin of intercession of saints, since he goes back to the first monarchs of Assyria and Phœnicia, and gives much valuable information respecting the Balaam gods so frequently mentioned in Scripture, who derived their origin from Baal, Belus, or Bel, the first king of Babel after Nimrod, and the

first canonized saint, and from whence Jezebel, the daughter of Ithobaal, king of Tyre, introduced the Balaam worship into Israel. But it appears from Mr. Mede, that Queen Dido must needs take her part in the pious work; and at a most sumptuous banquet wherein she entertained the Trojan princes and Pius Æneas on their escape from the ruins of Troy, her Phœnician Majesty is represented as pouring out libations to the deified Belus, and which is very beautifully told in Virgil's first Æneid, line 734—

"*Implevitque mero, pateram quam Belus et omnes*
A Belo soliti."

Which lines I find thus elegantly translated by Dryden, including the four verses which follow in the Latin:—

"Now Dido crowns the bowl of state with wine—
The bowl of Belus and the regal line—
Her hands aloft the shining goblet hold,
Pond'rous with gems and rough with sculptured gold.
When silence was proclaimed, the royal fair
Thus to the gods *addrest* her fervent prayer."

This reference of the Latin poet to the Hebrew prophet is remarkable, and Elijah said, cry aloud, "and they called on the name of Baal from morning even until noon, saying, O Baal, hear us." (1 Kings xviii. 26.)

This act on the part of Dido, in invocating the canonized Belus, was doubtless very impious, but Dido knew no better, and she acted upon an *a priori* view of her duty. She believed that the departed monarch was elevated to the highest heavens, where he had *power to intercede* and take an interest in her behalf, and from this *a priori* view she reasoned rightly that the departed saint was to be invocated.

Her Phœnician Majesty would have thought it absurd if even a Pearson or Crakanthorp of those times had reasoned with her against the folly and impiety of using invocation, unless he had previously convinced her that the intercession of the Saint Belus, reigning in heaven, in her behalf, was not likewise a fond and idle tale.

The argument which I shall now proceed to elucidate is one which is well known to every reader of the Bible, although its application in reference to the question at issue is not often called for in a community which is strictly Protestant. Haply, in regard to any credit which *we* attach to the absurd doctrine of intercession of saints, *we* labour not under the [illegible], and *require not the antidote*. The fundamental principles of our faith are abundantly clear if men would *let them so be*. He who runs may read, and the wayfaring man who humbly seeks salvation through the co-operation of the eternal Godhead—one God, one Mediator, one Holy Ghost—cannot err therein, and it is only when vain philosophy and human systems are used to darken, confuse, and mystify the simplicity of our faith, that we are required to enter into the more elaborate reasoning of scriptural analogy.

When Moses was directed to construct a ritual of the Jewish worship he was again and again admonished to make everything according to a pattern which had been previously shewn him by God Himself. He was to make a tabernacle after the pattern, which in the Jewish ritual was called (by St. Pau,) worldly, because it consisted of external things, tangible and visible, which typified heaven, said not to be made with hands. (Heb. ix. 24.) This tabernacle had two divisions—the holy place, and the holy of holies; into the former the ordinary priests went daily, but into the latter none dare to enter but the High Priest alone to make atonement and intercession for the people. Here the High Priest presented himself before the mercy seat, the lid of the ark, where was a visible token of God's presence, in reply to the High Priest's intercessions. (Ex. xxv. 35; Lev. xvi. 24; Josephus, book 3.)

Such being a brief sketch of the places of ministration, and the persons who ministered, Mr. Mede takes the following view:—"Now, in the tabernacle of this world, as was in the first tabernacle, we may haply find many priests whom to employ as agents (ministers) for us with God—but in the

second tabernacle, which is heaven, there is but one agent to be employed—but one who hath royal commission to deal between God and men—that angel of the presence, as Isaiah calls him. (Is. lxiii. 9.) And only one mediator, Jesus Christ the Lord of Glory, who in this prerogative is above saints and angels; for to which of the saints or angels said God at any time, "Sit on my right hand till I make thine enemies thy footstool?" (Heb. i.) And again: "As in the law none but the High Priest *alone* was to do office in the holiest place, so Christ Jesus *now* is the only agent for whatsoever is to be done for us in the holiest tabernacle of the heavens." (Heb. ix.) "Besides, we read that none but the High Priest alone was to offer incense, or to incense the most holy place when he entered it; but incense is the prayers of the saints, (Rev. viii.), sent thither from this outward temple of the militant church, as the incense in the law was fetched from without the veil: this, therefore, none in heaven but Christ alone must receive from *us* to offer for us." (Mede, book 3, 788.)

For the sake of brevity, I have clipped the wings of this analogical argument, but the very learned writer anteriorily enters into a disquisition on the mysterious nature of the Melchizedec order of priesthood, and the unique character of that personage—his appointment to be the priest of the most high God, without any intervention on the part of man, and the superiority of his office, as such, compared with the priesthood of Aaron, who, and his successors in that office under the law of Moses, could only and *alone* enter, into the Adytum within the veil, where, in his alone typical character, he made intercession for the church and people of God; all which things were according to the admonition given unto Moses, figures of the eternal Priesthood of our Lord himself, when through His body He entered into the most holy place in the heavens, there in that alone "*onemost*" character "to appear in the presence of God for us," "to make intercession for us."

When we consider the philosophy of this reasoning, we may well say, "Whom have we in heaven but Thee? and there is none upon earth we desire beside Thee."

Our profound theologian does not *run into extremes;* while he follows Scripture as his guide and text book, he by no means discards the writings of other learned men, but with this wise caution, only to regard those writings for so much as they are worth. Had the Provost observed this wise caution, he would not have floundered in a "Serbonian bog," from which he may find some difficulty of emergence.

"*Sed revocare gradum,*
Hoc opus hic labor est."

In his third book,—"Apostasy of the latter times,"—taking an *a priori* view of the subject, Mr. Mede shews that the heretical dogma we are considering was the universal philosophy of the Apostles' times, and the times long before them. (See 1 Tim. iv. 1, 2.) He says that the Greek word *Apostasia* in scripture use, when it looks towards a person signifies a revolt; when it looks towards God, a spiritual revolt—a criticism which is very apposite to our present enquiry, since the dogma of the intercession of saints is most decidedly a spiritual declension from the alone onemost intercession of our Great High Priest, Jesus, the Mediator of a better covenant than that of the law, to which belonged the worldly sanctuary and priesthood already considered.

The advocates of the doctrine of intercession of saints will here gain little advantage in the matter of priority of dates. The author now cited refers to Plato, Plutarch, Apulcius, Thales, Pythogaras, and all the academics anterior to the Christian era, but he says he had rather read a Father of the Christian church. Let him but turn to the eighth and ninth books of St. Austin, from whose works, out of the many quotations before me, I select the two following, which are rendered in Latin :—

"Qualis sit religio, in qua docetur, quod homines ut commendentur Diis, bonis dæmonibus uti debeant advocatis."

What a religion is it! that teacheth men to use good demons (deified saints) to commend them to the gods. And again; "Ad consequendam vitam beatam non tali mediatore indigere hominem, qualis est dæmon, sed tali qualis est unus Christus." To attain a blessed life man hath no need of a deified saint, but of Christ alone.

The Church of England has of late years been doomed to lament a growing declension among the members of her community. How this is to be accounted for is not for me to opine, but it has been suggested that she has lost something at the Reformation which we would wistfully look back upon, and clutch, like Macbeth clutching the fatal dagger. I speak as to facts which have been universally known in England and elsewhere.

Possibly the great names of those who began the retrograde course may account for the leaven. The *prestige* of name has a great effect; let a man acquire a great name either as a politician or a divine, and he is sure to require a wider gate for his followers to enter. And is not this fact exemplified in the case before us? Pearson, and Bull, and Beveridge, have obtained the *prestige* of a great name, but they are advocates of the dogma of intercession of saints, and therefore we must believe that doctrine—"Pearson, *our text book*, must be followed," and the not doing so would be "setting at nought the authorities of the church's great divines."

And mark how the opinions of men with great names are imbibed. We have here, (pages 47, 48,) a citation from Crakanthorp, an Oxford divine, who affirms the dogma of the intercession of saints, but draws a line of distinction between meritorious and deprecatory intercession. This, the Provost thinks "a most distinct and judicious statement of the question," and to which he invites particular attention!!

Now, this "distinct and judicious statement" is an old Romanizing sophism, designed for the nonce, to qualify the dogma, and give it some semblance of congruity with Pro-

testant reformed principles; and it is not a little remarkable that this authority, (Crakanthorp,) is dated Oxford, 1847, which identifies the Romanizing tendency of such writings with that system of teaching which, in these times, seems to have many admirers, and which does indeed savour strongly of a "looking back at something lost at the Reformation."

Our celebrated author, Mede, of the seventeenth century, after proving with great force of argument, that the offering of intercessory prayer from us to Godward, is the incommunicable prerogative of the *onemost* Mediator, proceeds to notice this Romanizing sophism. He says, "Neither will this demonstration admit that *vulgar exception* to be of any force--namely, that expiatory mediation or that meritorious intercession in heaven should indeed appertain to Christ alone, but favourable intercession on the part of the saints to pray for us. I should say that this rag is too narrow and short to cover their nakedness who lay hold on it." (Book 3, page 788.)

But Crakanthorp seems to have penetrated into all the mystery and arcana of the intercessory duties of the glorified saints, as we learn by the next paragraph cited, page 48: "In the next paragraph, Crakanthorp shews that he disallows particular intercession only so far as it implies a knowledge on the part of the saints at rest, of the present condition of the saints on earth."

The reader will here perceive that the great struggle of these divines is to make a show of divesting the supposed interest which glorified saints take in our behalf, from those intercessory and mediatorial characters which can only belong to the second glorious person of the Holy Trinity. But their arguments will not meet the test of sober enquiry. The dogma of intercession of saints, even in a qualified aspect, would, by the law of homogeniety, be of like nature or kind as that offered by Christ Himself, and therefore in spirit an invasion of our Lord's prerogative in His incommunicable office of the one Mediator between God and man.

It is the property of Scripture doctrine that whensoever its integrity is invaded, it rejects every species of defence that is not founded upon right reason, combined with its own internal evidence; and on the other hand, whatever illusory principles or spurious systems are attempted to be intermixed with its truth, such attempts can only be defended by sophistry and false reasoning, bearing with them their own refutation.

Take an example of the latter from the following paragraph, page 48 :—

"If a good man, departed out of this life, continues to offer for his friends, and for the church at large, the same supplications which he was wont to offer upon earth, in the name and for the sake of Christ, can it with any shadow of reason be maintained that the one intercession more than the other trenches on the inviolable prerogative of Him by whom alone we come unto the Father?"

This is is an analogical argument which, being defective in its figures, is illegitimate in its conclusion. It is composed of these counter elements as figures of comparison :—

1. The intercession of glorified, immortal saints, redeemed from all sin and made perfect in holiness.

2. The intercession of dying sinful human beings—or sin and holiness—death and immortality.

3. Perfect knowledge of commanded duties in the present world.

4. Total ignorance of supposed intercessory duties in the world to come.

We are taught and commanded to make prayers and supplications, and we approach God from the outward sanctuary of the church on earth, through faith in Christ, as mortal beings, sinful yet penitent. Such it was our Lord's peculiar office to hear, while He was on earth, and for the same purpose (to hear sinners,) is He *exalted* to the heavenly sanctuary, there to be our *onemost* intercessor, and to accept our prayers and supplications. In all this we have the clearest

light of Scripture for our guide, and nothing on the other hand to direct us in the application of the comparison *here* sought to be instituted; in truth no comparison exists, and none is contemplated in Scripture; this analogy therefore, is the excogitation of the human mind, "intruding," as St. Paul says, "into things not seen."

From sophisms the learned gentleman descends into paradoxes—(pages 92 and 93); but here his statement is so enveloped in verbiage, it is difficult to extract from it a tangible proposition. I shall merely take one sentence which comes between two periods:—

"Let a young man be taught to dread and abhor the opinion that departed saints pray for us, even as he dreads and abhors the practice of the invocation of saints, and the natural result will be, that by giving to the Romanist a very easy victory over him on the former point, you will secure for him an equally easy victory on the latter."

How such a result can follow from the premises contained in the first clause of this sentence is to me paradoxical.

If the horror and dread of the dogma of intercession of saints entertained by a young man were nothing more than the emotions of prejudice without knowledge, yet not without common sense, I should even then think (prejudice being a stubborn passion,) the victory would be doubtful, but, *a fortiori*, if these emotions be strengthened by a right knowledge of scriptural truth, and the mind of the youth be not imbued with principles introductory to the reception of the error we contemplate, I will then affirm the victory will be no longer doubtful. On these data, the initiative of dread and horror of the doctrine of intercession of saints taken by the youth, will be strengthened and confirmed by his knowledge of the Bible, and I deny that any such result as that contemplated in the preamble of words before me can follow, unless our youth casts his Bible at the feet of his opponent and turns to the beggarly elements, the Romanising teaching contained in the

extracts referred to. A system of teaching founded upon such extracts, or upon the *peculiar selected tenets* of any class of writers put forward in manuscript as text books, is objectionable.

The characteristics assigned to the Virgin Mary by Pearson, may be very scriptural, but Pearson gratuitously carries instruction on this point beyond *scriptural precedent*, and the making that subject a prominent branch of teaching, is rather giving a bias in favour of Mariolatry, and intercession of saints.

Happily and wisely, after the stupendous events of Calvary and Bethany, the inspired writers preserve a significant and studied taciturnity as to any mention of the blessed Virgin; and therefore the introduction of questions relating to her antitypical and other characters, is pushing theological teaching beyond scriptural requirement; and is neither useful for edification nor commended by apostolic example.

I have now before me a useful monthly periodical, the "Achill *Missionary Herald*," which treats much of the sayings and doings of those who would corrupt the simplicity of our faith; and as I write, my eye glances over the May, 1859, number, which gives an extract of Lord Fielding's speech at Holywell in England, in defence of the pretended miracle of the liquifaction of the blood of St. Januarius. His Lordship's "gullibility" was taken by witnessing the performance of the juggling trick in Naples, and he is an apostate from the Protestant faith, but he takes an *a priori* view of his supposed duty, he believes that the saint is invested with power of intercession, and therefore that the worship of the saint is to be defended and his relics venerated: this is the third point in the seventh article of the Pope Pius IV. Creed. The Bishop of Huron takes an *a priori* view, when he reasons from cause to effect, and says in his pastoral—"when young men are thus taught in the creed we profess to believe, that the saints departed take an interest in our spiritual welfare, and probably

intercede with God for us, the transition is easy to—Holy St. Dominick, pray for us."

The Provost of Trinity College takes an anomalous view, when he thinks he can disintegrate two allied principles, and teach the initiatory principle without its producing either a remote or proximate effect. All men have not that philosophical turn of mind, to see such a recondite distinction between cause and effect; neither is the mind of every young man fortified with so nice a discernment of truth, that he can be taught to believe in the rudiments of error, without inducing a false principle of reasoning, and in matters of religion a perverted sentimentality. Finally, if in these pages I have in any degree exhibited the dogma of intercession of saints in its anti-scriptural character, and stripped the subject of the covering of vain philosophy in which it is enveloped in the pamphlet, and in the extracts therein cited, I shall be abundantly satisfied that my labour has not been in vain.

is easy to—Holy

n anomalous view,
ied principles, and
producing either a
ot that philosophi-
istinction between
every young man
h, that he can be
or, without induc-
matters of religion
these pages I have
ession of saints in
the subject of the
enveloped in the
, I shall be abun-
in vain.